

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE

**Public Lands Section
Department of Natural Resources
1594 West North Temple
Room 1010
January 9, 2007 - 9:00am**

Minutes

Members Present:

**HARTY, Kimm, Utah Geological Survey
ZAREKARIZI, Susan - Parks and Recreation
ADAMS, Todd – Div. of Water Resources
HIGGINS, Rick - SITLA
GRUBAUGH-LITTIG, Pamela – Div. of Oil Gas and Mining
CLARK, Robert – DEQ/Air Quality
BAILEY, Carmen - Division of Wildlife Resources
JONES, Gregory - GOED
GRIERSON, Dave – Forestry, Fire & State Lands
GUNNELL, Roy – Utah Dept. Agriculture & Food
SEDDON, Matthew – Div. of State History
SCHLOTTHAUER, Bill – Div. of Water Rights
BIRKES, William - Drinking Water
CHANEY, Jerry - UDOT
BOHN, Ralph - Solid Hazardous Waste
HOWARD, Ty - Environmental Remediation Response
WATANABE, Judy - DPS/DHS Homeland Security
QUICK, Shelly - Water Quality**

Others Present:

**WRIGHT, Carolyn - PLPCO
JEMMING, Jonathan – PLPCO
COTTAM, Brian – GOPB
HUNSAKER, Lori - PLPCO
DANIELS, Kevin - GOPB
ROY, Cordell – National Parks**

Kimm Harty, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:10 a.m. Because of all the members being present (new faces) she asked the committee members to introduce themselves.

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the December 12, 2006 meeting were approved by Pamela Grubaugh-Littig, and seconded by Matthew Seddon. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Elections

Jonathan Jemming (Jonny) gave a brief explanation of the role of RDCC, and opened the discussion and nominations for elections for the Resource Development Coordinating Committee (RDCC) chair and vice-chair. Kimm Harty nominated Susan Zarekarizi for chair, seconded by Pamela Grubaugh-Littig. The motion passed unanimously. Susan Zarekarizi nominated Dave Grierson for vice-chair, seconded by Matt Seddon. The motion passed unanimously. Jonny will be meeting this afternoon with John Nixon (acting State Planning Coordinator), Director of GOPB, at 2:00 pm, for his confirmation of the election.

III. 2006 Land Use Survey – Kevin Daniels

Kevin gave an overview of the land use planning survey. For further questions he can be reached at (801) 538-1438. Please see attached.

II. Reports from Agencies on Any Anticipated Projects

Jonathan Jemming, PLPCO, reported one item that is huge for the PLPCO Office is the Programmatic EIS Oil Shale that is ongoing with the BLM.

Brian Cottam, GOPB, distributed a copy of the State and Local Planning Section, Winter 2006 – 2007 update. There will be more presentations given by GOPB. The budget section within GOPB has been working on budget recommendations, this has kept their staff very busy. They are now gearing up for the legislature.

Jerry Chaney, UDOT, reported, they are very busy as an agency, they are working on tons of projects, about ten EAs and ten EISs throughout the state, and a lot of work in southern Utah. Typically (UDOT) will submit their draft plans to RDCC when the document is open for public review. After the completion of the draft, the final is sent out, and then the record of decision. Jonny mentioned it would be helpful if they could run the scoping document through RDCC.

Ty Howard, Environmental Remediation Response, reported, they are in the process with EPA to list a superfund site in Bountiful, at this time they do have support with Bountiful City. It is located at the Five Points Mall. This is a very high priority item.

Judy Watanabe, DPS/DHS Homeland Security, gave a brief description of her role at Homeland Security.

Bill Schlotthauer, Div. Water Rights, reported Argyle Canyon comments are due at the end of the month. More detailed information on this topic can be found on the division's web site. March 13, 2007 there will be a public meeting to discuss the process to develop a groundwater management plan for the Beryl-Enterprise areas. It will be held at Enterprise High School. If you want to get on the mailing list for information on the Beryl-Enterprise Plan please e-mail your contact information to James Greer with Division of Water Rights.

Bob Clark, Air Quality, reported that DAQ management has been meeting for the past year with representatives from EPA, BLM, and the oil and gas industry that operate in the area of the Uintah Basin. They are very concerned that the increased oil and gas exploration activity in the basin could lead to increased emissions of criteria pollutants and possibly have an impact on the States current attainment status relating to all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). DAQ has developed a preliminary emissions inventory for the area and recently located a monitoring station in Vernal. With the help of industry partners, the State anticipates to be able to site two additional monitoring stations in the area this year.

Dave Grierson, Div. Forestry, Fire and State Lands, reported there are no (FFSL) projects on the RDCC listing at this time. The Selenium Task Force for the GSL are in the midst of doing several research projects. Walt Baker is the chair for the committee.

Susan Zarekarizi, Parks and Recreation, reported, Dead Horse State Park RMP is out, one known change is to add paleo back into the resource section of the plan. They will be purchasing two acres of land at Bear Lake for a trail head.

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig, DOGM, reported that the BLM is starting the EIS for Alton leases. Alton Coal Development, LLC has a permit application for the private property however, it is not complete yet. When this application is determined administratively complete, the application will go through the RDCC process. The proposed federal leases will be around the proposed coal mine that is on private property. The Lila Canyon Extension of the Horse Canyon Mine review continues. Jonathan Jemming commended DOGM for the work they have done in working on this proposal.

Jeanette Matovich, BLM, via e-mail asked to add her following comments to the minutes. BLM is still receiving calls from personnel in other divisions asking about ongoing EISs and Land Use Plans. We encourage people to use the ENBB website: <http://www.ut.blm.gov/ENBBTEMP/enbbtemp.html>.

Jonathan Jemming thanked Kimm Harty, Chair, for her commitment to the Committee for the past two years.

Kimm Harty, Chair, thanked Dave and Susan for accepting their new position as chair and vice chair. She also thanked Carolyn for the **excellent** job she has done with RDCC.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately at 10:20 am, the next meeting will be held February 13, 2007, Department of Natural Resources, 1594 West North Temple, room 3710.

Introduction:

The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget conducted a land use planning survey in the summer of 2006 in order to provide a snapshot of current planning practices of local governments in Utah.

The survey results will serve to provide a point of reference to local government officials seeking to learn of land use approaches being used in other jurisdictions. In addition to this the results of this survey will be used to inform public policy debates concerning the need for land use planning in Utah. The survey will also serve as an educational tool for the Governor and the legislative branch concerning the importance of planning in Utah.

The survey was sent out to representatives from all of Utah's 270 municipal and county governments. In addition, the survey was also made available online at planning.utah.gov. The Governor's office of Planning and Budget received completed surveys from over 87 municipal and county governments, with at least one local government reporting from 28 of 29 counties. From the responses a reliable sample of Utah's local governments was obtained.

Population Categories	Number of Municipalities	Number Reporting	Reporting Percentage
Less than 2,000	138	57	41%
2,000-5,000	29	17	59%
5,000-10,000	30	17	57%
Greater than 10,000	44	20	45%
Counties	29	11	38%
Total	270	122	45%

The General Plan

A general plan is an essential framework required by state law for all Utah's local governments. The general plan provides direction in regard to growth and development of all or any part of the land within the jurisdiction. In addition to this, the general plan provides for a vision of the local government's present and future needs. Ultimately, it is up to the local government to decide the comprehensiveness and format of the general plan.

The percentage of local governments reporting that they had adopted a general plan was exceptionally high at 98%. The remaining 2% of reporting local governments indicated that they were in the process of drafting a general plan. The high percentage of local governments having adopted a general plan is an indication of the high level of compliance on the part of the local governments to state code.

Planning Staff and Support

56% of local governments responding to the survey had a full time planning staff. In the smaller municipalities it is common for a staff member to function as a planner in addition to many other responsibilities.

Many local governments receive outside assistance in their planning efforts. The following table is indicative of other resources that local governments may utilize in addition to any staff they may have.

Does your municipality/county use the following for planning assistance:			
		Response Total	Response Percent
Planning consultant		52	50%
University		22	21%
County		21	20%
City		22	21%
Other		22	21%
Total Respondents		102	

The majority of local governments also have a Planning Commission (98%) and a large portion have a separate Board of Adjustment (89%) that assist in the planning process.

Geographic Information Systems

55% of local governments have in-house Geographic Information Systems capabilities while only 39% of local governments create new Geographic Information Systems data. The large portion of any new data created by local governments is related to utilities, roads, and zoning.

Support regarding Geographic Information Systems is garnered from various resources. The following graph serves to illustrate possible resources for G.I.S information.

Does your municipality/county use any of the following for Geographic Information Systems (GIS) support?			
		Response Total	Response Percent
Private consultant		37	46%
		22	28%
		22	28%
		11	14%
Total Responses		81	

The preceding graph makes it clear that local governments use a variety of different resources for G.I.S support.

Plan Elements and Regulations

In regard to plan elements and regulations the survey sought to find out whether a local government had a general plan element and/or a regulation/ordinance for each topic area. The intent was to determine at what levels the local governments addressed each topic and how much follow through the topic received in the planning process. For example, on the topic of affordable housing, the survey sought to determine the following: (1) has the local government adopted a general plan element that addresses affordable housing, and (2) has the local government adopted specific regulations (e.g., inclusionary zoning) to directly impact and address affordable housing shortages?

The following table shows the frequency that local governments included topical areas in their general plans or had regulations in regard to topical areas.

	Element (a section or a chapter of a general plan that addresses current conditions, goals and objectives etc.)	Regulation (specific codified regulatory guidance (ordinance, resolution) that is usually contained within a land use code, zoning resolution etc.)
Adult-oriented business	9% (11)	63% (72)
Affordable housing	69% (79)	32% (37)
Affordable housing incentives (e.g. inclusionary zoning)	31% (36)	15% (17)
Agriculture	41% (47)	57% (66)
Air Quality	19% (22)	9% (11)
Airports	15% (17)	18% (21)
Alternative energy supply	4% (5)	3% (3)
Capital improvements	51% (59)	29% (33)
Clustering	30% (35)	41% (47)
Community services	31% (36)	29% (33)
Cultural/historical	42% (49)	21% (24)
Design	23% (27)	41% (47)
Economic development	49% (57)	15% (17)

Floodplain	35% (40)	49% (56)
Geologic hazards: liquefaction	17% (20)	25% (29)
Geologic hazards: earthquakes	23% (27)	29% (33)
Geologic hazards: landslides	20% (24)	30% (34)
Growth management	43% (49)	18% (21)
Homeland security	14% (16)	11% (13)
Housing	54% (62)	31% (36)
Manufactured housing	20% (23)	57% (65)
Mass/rapid transit	16% (18)	1% (1)
Mineral extraction	(5) 4%	18% (21)
Mobile home parks	16% (19)	57% (66)
Nuisance (junk)	21% (24)	72% (83)
Oil/gas	3% (4)	7% (8)
Open space	50% (58)	51% (59)
Parks and recreation	62% (72)	49% (56)
Pipelines	8% (9)	17% (20)

Planned unit development	25% (29)	59% (68)
Public facilities	51% (59)	44% (51)
Public safety	41% (47)	44% (51)
Purchase of development rights	5% (6)	3% (4)
Transfer of development rights	9% (10)	10% (11)
Recreation/tourism	38% (44)	11% (13)
Redevelopment/infill	17% (20)	17% (20)
School siting	13% (15)	10% (11)
Signs	23% (26)	74% (85)
Storm water run-off/drainage	29% (33)	54% (62)
Subdivision	27% (31)	82% (95)
Subdivision exemptions	7% (8)	39% (45)
Transit oriented development	9% (10)	7% (8)
Transportation	55% (63)	25% (29)
Urban development	19% (22)	18% (21)
Viewshed corridor protection	18% (21)	13% (15)
Wastewater management	27% (31)	46% (53)

Water quality	33% (38)	52% (60)
Watershed protection	29% (32)	37% (42)
Water supply/conservation	30% (34)	45% (52)
Wildfire hazards	14% (16)	15% (17)
Zoning	43% (50)	88% (101)
Total Respondents		115
(skipped this question)		7

Impact Fees

Impact fees are a one time fee assessed against a new development that attempts to recover the cost incurred by a local government in providing the public facilities required to serve new development. 87% of respondent local governments reported to using some type of impact fee or land dedication or fee in lieu. The following table is indicative of the type and frequency that impact fees, land dedication, or fee in lieu were used.

	Impact Fee (a one time fee assessed against a new development that attempts to recover the cost incurred by a local government in providing the public facilities required to serve new development)	Land Dedication or Fee in Lieu
Affordable housing	12%(12)	9%(9)
Parks and recreation	53%(53)	9%(9)
Public safety	27%(27)	4%(4)
Schools	1%(1)	1%(1)
Sewer	59%(59)	5%(5)
Storm drainage	31%(31)	9%(9)
Transportation	28%(28)	8%(8)
Water	78%(78)	12%(12)
Other	19%(19)	8%(8)

Total Respondents	99
(skipped this question)	23

Conclusions

Utah local governments have a wide range of land use planning tools available to them to deal with the changes and impacts brought on by growth and new development.

More and more communities are seeing the value in developing a detailed general plan. However, there are still many communities in need of resources to conduct effective planning. This survey also brought to light the need for more comprehensive general plans that account for changes in state code. As communities in Utah continue to experience change and growth the need for sound comprehensive planning will increase.